

REMARKS:

Pursuant to an Interview on January 18, 2005, Examiner Philip Tucker indicated that the pending claims would be allowable if the term "polymer beads" were to be amended to "copolymer beads" in all the claims. All the pending claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-20 will now be allowable since the claims are adding graphite to the subject matter of claims in previously issued related patents.

In an Official Action dated January 26, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has indicated that there is no antecedent basis for "said second carrier" in claims 9 and 16, or their parent claims 1 and 10. In response, the Applicant has amended claims 9 and 16 to provide an antecedent basis for "second carrier" [claim 9 now depends on claim 7 and claim 16 now depends on claim 14].


The Examiner is also rejecting claims 1-3, 5-12 and 14-20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over: claims 17, 20, 24, 36 and 39 of U.S. Patent No. 6,734,145; claims 1, 7-10, 13, 23, 27 and 29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,737,384; and claims 1, 3, 5-16, 19-29 and 31-40 of copending U.S. Application Serial No. 10/667,415.

In response, the Applicant is submitting a terminal disclaimer to overcome any provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

In view of the actions taken and arguments presented, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is now in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Dan M. de la Rosa
Reg. No. 38,429
345 East 80th St., Suite 27H
New York, NY 10021
Phone (212) 570-6597
Fax (212) 570-9053

Dated: February 14, 2005